	Washo		No. Paiute		C. Miwok		Great Basin
	Sa		Sa		Sa		141
Face length - women	5	120	5	117	7	118	
Face breadth - men	6	151	6	150	9	152	
Face breadth - women	4	145	5	140	7	143	
Nose length - men	6	55	6	57	9	56	53.68
Nose length - women	5	52	5	51	7	53	
Nose breadth - men	6	43	6	44	9	45	43.87
Nose breadth - women	5	40	5	40	7	41	
Ear length - men	6	69	4	67	3	73	
Ear length - women	5	67	5	66	3	72	
Ear breadth - men	6	34	4	34	3	35	
Ear breadth - women	5	35	5	30	3	35	

Although the use of such small samples in the above data limits the level of confidence we can have in any theoretical statements, a few tentative remarks may be made. In spite of linguistic and geographical barriers, the Washo appear racially very similar to their neighbors to both the east and west of the Sierra Nevada. [114]

The close similarity in the indices and measurements of these groups is an indication of a relatively large inbreeding population. On the other hand, the Washo sample showed a low degree of variability from one individual to the next, an indication that a small homogenous gene pool is present. There is ethnographic evidence to support both views. The Washo did intermarry with the Northern Paiute, in Antelope Valley and probably at the Honey Lake area as well. The Washo also carried on trade and social intercourse with the central valley Californian peoples. In fact, part of Gifford's sample (not included here) contained Washo individuals who had one non-Washo parent. One also hears of the social conservatism of the Washo and their past fears of Miwok and Northern Paiute raids, factors against outbreeding. 512 141 161 [143] [839] [648]

Social Organization

Compared with primitive peoples generally, the Washo kinship system is neither elaborate nor extensive. There is little emphasis on lineage or ancestors. "The Washo lacked sibs, lineages, and clans" (Freed 1960, 361). Reckoning of descent is bilateral. Certain behaviors that are rigidly prescribed in many primitive societies are absent in Washo society. There is no mother-in-law avoidance. Monogamy, polygny, and polyandry (fraternal) are all practiced, although monogamy is most common and polyandry is rare. Sororal polygny and the levirate occur, but neither the sororate nor the levirate are required. This writer has knowledge of only two apparently polyandrous marriages.[1] 61 64 602 606 595 587

Residence after marriage is usually bilocal (that is, petrilocal or metrilocal), but the couple may move in with relatives other than the parents. Inheritance 591

Ti Freed NT20 Washo NT20

128

554

602

593 /For the statistical analyses of the results of the role-profile test and their application to the status and role of the individual in the society in relationship to primary and secondary kin relations, see category 116, pp. 372-375, 378(A)--413./

[P 354, B]

177
178

old, prewhite culture survives most strongly in language, ceremony, and, as we shall see in the next chapter, social structure. The most important change with reference to this study has been the lessening of coöperative activity. This trend has progressed farthest in economics. Although the economic unit has always been the nuclear family, aboriginal economic activity emphasized group coöperation much more than it does today. The modern Indian works for wages; he is part of the larger society where economic activity is impersonal and one's coworkers may be relative strangers. If an Indian family so chooses, it can be economically independent of relatives and friends. This same trend is visible to a lesser extent in ceremonials. The prewhite curing ceremony was a group affair; but modern, white medicine is essentially a relationship between doctor and patient. There is no longer a large group of friends and relatives standing by to lend moral support. Some ceremonies, such as the pine-nut dance, have disappeared completely.

[594]
[465]
[464]
[755]
[602]
[535]

601
178
554

be seen that the data strongly support the foregoing inferences, thereby supporting the validity of the assumption of a close fit between role and term. The close correlation of role and term together with the fact that the Washo kinship system is changing in spite of a relatively stable social structure supports the hypothesis that roles may vary considerably within the limits set by a given configuration of social structure, the variation being due to causes which lie outside of the social organization.

THE ROLE PROFILE TEST

125
602 ●

The role profile test makes use of sixteen categories for describing interpersonal behavior developed by Freedman, Leary, Ossorio, and Coffey (1951). I have slightly modified the categories and converted them into a questionnaire, which appears below. As conceived by Freedman and his associates, the sixteen categories were arranged in a circle. This emphasizes an important feature of the conceptual scheme. It has four nodal points: dominance, affiliation, submission, and hostility. These nodal points occur in the questionnaire at Question 1 (dominance), Question 5 (affiliation), Question 9 (submission), and Question 13 (hostility). The questions between the nodes combine the nodal qualities in varying degrees. For example, "to teach" (Question 2) is a combination of dominance and affiliation; "to punish" (Question 14) is a combination of hostility and dominance.

Questionnaire of the Role Profile Test

1. Which relative most often tries to tell you what to do? Which most often gives you orders (or bosses you)?
2. Which relative most often teaches you how to do something? Which one gives you advice or tells you his opinions?
3. Which relative is most likely to help you if you need it?
4. Which relative is most likely to feel bad and sympathize with you when something goes wrong?
5. Which relative is specially fond of you?
6. Which relative most often coöperates (works together) with you?
7. Which relative depends on you most and most often asks your help?
8. Which relative respects you the most? Which one asks your opinions?
9. Which relative obeys (minds) you if you tell him or her to do something?
10. Which relative is most eager for your approval?
11. Which relative would be the most likely to say or think you did something wrong (or bad)?
12. Which relative nags you most?
13. Which relative disapproves of you and criticizes you most often?
14. Which relative punishes you or gets angry (or mad) if you don't mind or if you do something wrong (or bad)?
15. Which relative is most likely to refuse you help even if you need it pretty badly?
16. Which relative would be most likely not to want to have anything at all to do with you?

The role profile test is administered as follows.

[P 366, A]

125
602

The informant is provided with slips of paper containing Washo kinship terms written quasiphonetically for all the relatives he possesses in first ascending, ego's, and first descending generations. These, of course, differ from person to person. The informant is then asked to arrange the slips of paper in a column in response to each of the sixteen questions. The relative ranking highest in the behavior questioned is to be placed at the top of the column; the remainder are to be ranked in descending order, with the one ranking lowest in the behavior in question to be placed at the bottom. The first few questions are for practice and designed to acquaint the informant with the kind of response desired. The investigator asks "which of your relatives weighs most . . . is tallest . . . is oldest" or some other similar question, and instructs the informant to arrange the slips of paper, helping him if necessary. Once the "set" of the experiment is established, the questionnaire is administered. The questions are explained to the informant, using examples if necessary; they are not read mechanically. The informant's responses are noted for each question, and the paper slips are shuffled before the next question is given. The result is a test protocol ranking a person's relatives in each of the sixteen categories of interpersonal behavior.

Several precautions must be observed if the test results are to attain their maximum reliability. First, the investigator must determine the opportunity the informant has had for knowing and interacting with the relatives to be included in the test. If there has been a reasonable opportunity for interacting with a relative, he is to be included in the test even if the informant has had little interaction with him. If there has been no opportunity for interaction, the relative should be excluded. For example, if a relative has lived close to the informant for many years, he is to be included even though the informant rarely sees him. In this case, the opportunity for interaction exists, and the fact that none has taken place may be an important feature of the role behavior. However, if a relative died when the informant was a baby, or lives at a great distance, or is feeble-minded, he is to be excluded, for the informant has had no opportunity to interact with him.

124
125

Second, the same interpreter should be used for all informants. This should not be taken too literally, for feuds and hard feelings can make the presence of particular interpreters unpleasant to informants. In addition, if the interpreter is related to the informant, this might tend to influence the informant's responses. It is probably best to use an interpreter who is not related to the informant. This precaution could not be observed for two Washo informants owing to the prevailing rules of courtesy. These two informants were slightly deaf and it was necessary to shout at them. Among the Washo, it is considered impolite for a person to shout at a nonrelative. Therefore, relatives had to be used as interpreters.

[576]

125

Third, the testing situation should be standardized. This means that as few relatives as possible should be looking over the informant's shoulder while he is taking the test. An easy way to shed distracting relatives is to conduct the interview in an automobile.

Fourth, the questions should be asked randomly. I suspect that there is some contagion from one question to the next. This is enhanced if, for example, all the questions probing dominance are asked one after the other. By randomizing the questions, the investigator

125
[124]
[602]

fuse to be interviewed at all. This reduced somewhat the number of old people in the sample. Two people could not finish the test: one old woman, after completing four questions, burst into tears at the mention of a dead relative; and a young woman could not finish the last six questions, for she rejected the idea that any of her relatives could be hostile. The questions these women finished are perfectly usable and have been included in the analysis.

The sample includes 4 blind people, 4 others with whom I had to use interpreters, and 8 people who were illiterate. None of these 16 persons could manipulate the slips of paper by themselves. They could take the test, for they retained a mental list of the relatives involved and verbally directed the investigator as to the arrangement of the slips. The order of relatives was read back to them and they continued to make adjustments until they were satisfied. They handled the test fairly well, but not so well as people who could arrange the slips of paper themselves. This fact probably increases the variability of the protocols.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

128
554

The purpose of this analysis is to reduce the data to a form in which the patterns of role behavior become apparent, and their similarities and differences can easily be compared. Since the sample was not chosen at random from the population, inferences drawn from it about the larger population are, statistically speaking, dangerous.

Two factors make the handling of the data troublesome: (1) the number of relatives contained in the particular protocols is different, ranging from seven to fourteen; and (2) protocols with the same number of relatives often contain different kinds of relatives. The ordinary, nonparametric methods of treating ranked data assume that each individual ranks the same set of objects. Another possible method of analysis involves the construction of preference matrices for all relatives in all sixteen behavioral categories. This idea was discarded because the size of the matrices, together with the variability and the smallness of the numbers in the cells, did not seem to promise sufficient returns for the work involved.

Consequently, the question of quantifying the data was studied. Because of the unequal number of relatives in the various protocols and because the relatives were often different in kind, some sort of metric seemed unavoidable. Consider a specific category of behavior and assume that the characteristic which determines a person's rank can be measured numerically and is distributed normally in the population. Let X equal the numerical value of the characteristic. Then X is a normally distributed random variable which, for convenience and with no loss of generality, we can assume has mean zero and variance one, that is, approximately 68 per cent of the population have values of X between -1 and +1. Thus, there are a few individuals who have the characteristic to a marked positive degree leading to an almost certain rank of one in any comparison, and a few individuals who have the characteristic to a marked negative degree leading to an almost certain lowest rank.

Now suppose that you have a judge and you take a random sample of n individuals from the population and ask him to rank them. Further, suppose that you repeat this indefinitely with samples of n. Now consider

128
554

relative in all sixteen categories. The mean was calculated as follows:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i}{N}.$$

The standard error of the mean was calculated by the formula

$$S_{\bar{X}}^2 = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})^2}{N - 1}.$$

The 95 per cent confidence limits were estimated by the formula

$$\bar{X} \pm 2S_{\bar{X}}$$

(When x is distributed normally, the confidence coefficient corresponding to the interval $\bar{X} \pm 2S_{\bar{X}}$ is .954).

An inspection of the lengths of the confidence intervals revealed no striking differences among them. Comparisons of the end points of the confidence intervals showed the differences among the means of many relatives in each category of behavior to be significant because of the lack of overlap between the confidence intervals.

The male and female protocols were analyzed separately because it was assumed that roles are enacted somewhat differently toward men and women. That this assumption is correct is shown by the table on p. 395 (bottom). If the male and female protocols had been lumped, some of the differences in role behavior could have been obscured whenever the sex differences happenned to cancel each other. The fact that the male and female test protocols give slightly different results does not mean that we are dealing with two separate societies or that Washo society is stratified or segmented in any way. Since the Washo are one society and have essentially one kinship system, a significant distinction between two roles occurring among either men or women is regarded as a distinction obtaining for the whole society. Therefore, the following definition of role difference is used in this study: if the confidence intervals about the means of two roles fail to overlap in any category of behavior for either men or women, the roles are considered to differ significantly.

The results of the statistical analysis are given in Appendices I and II. Appendix III contains the graphs of the means of all the roles investigated. These graphs of means are called role profiles. Appendix IV presents the graphs of the sixteen categories with the kinship roles on the x axis.

ROLE BEHAVIOR

554
602
171

One general observation may be made before examining Washo kinship role by role. This concerns the distinctiveness of almost all the roles. The Washo are among the bilateral tribes of the Great Basin, Plateau, and California which are generally thought to contain little significant kinship patterning apart from family relationships. Murdock has investigated this

554
602
[171]

problem among the Tenino of central Oregon. He found a good deal of kinship patterning and concludes that there is considerable patterning of kinship behavior even in the simpler, sibless tribes (Murdock, 1949, pp. 111-112). The present study presents additional evidence in support of Murdock. The table on p. 395 (top) is a compilation of role comparisons indicating where the differences in the means are significant. This table shows Washo kinship behavior to be far from amorphous.

554
602
128
593

The role data are summarized below. The letters in parentheses after the kin terms are the abbreviations used in the appendices. The order in which the roles are given here is the same order observed in all the appendices.

Father (F). This relative ranks high in dominance (Categories 1-4), fairly high in affiliation (Categories 5-6), rather neutral in submission (Categories 7-10), and generally low in hostility. There is some ambivalence in the role of father regarding hostility because he is a disciplinarian for both men and women as shown by his high score in Category 14. In addition, women see him as a mildly suspicious and disapproving figure (Category 11). The only category where the role of father differs for men and women is Category 2 (to teach).

Father's brother (FB). This role differs considerably for men and women. He is a much more important relative for men than for women as indicated by his higher rating in all categories except the last two, which show rejection. The role differs significantly for men and women in Categories 2 (to teach) and 9 (to obey), and the difference comes very close to being significant in Category 1 (to order). The general role profile of father's brother for women is that of an unimportant relative with whom there is little interaction. The general role profile for men is roughly the same as that of father, the significant differences occurring in the first two categories.

Father's sister (FS). The role profile for father's sister is similar for both men and women. She is a rather cold and hostile figure; she ranks high only in hostility (Categories 11-13) and rejection (Categories 15 and 16). Although she is a disapproving relative, she possesses no disciplinary power over ego as shown by her negative score in Category 14. The role profile of father's sister is similar to that of mother's sister but ranks lower in most qualities except hostility and rejection. This is true for both men and women.

Mother (M). The role profile for mother is similar to that for father. She ranks high in dominance and affiliation, lower in submission, and low in hostility. Like father, she is a disciplinarian, as indicated by her fairly high score in Category 14. Category 11 (to suspect wrongdoing) shows a significant distinction between the male and female profiles, the women seeing their mothers as more suspicious. A similar distinction occurs for the father role, although the difference in role behavior is not significant. The mother is the most important and distinctive relative for a Washo. The table on p. 395 (top) gives 190 significant distinctions between mother and all other roles. This number is far more than the next closest relative, father, with 133.

Mother's brother (MB). This relative is neutral in dominance and affiliation, and low in submission, for both men and women. Mother's brother is a

554
602
128
593

more suspicious and hostile figure for women than for men (Categories 11, 12, 13, and 14). For the most part, mother's brother is a rather neutral figure showing few large positive or negative scores.

Mother's sister (MS). This relative is a much more dominating figure for women than for men. The difference is significant in Category 2 (to teach). Mother's sister is neutral in affection for both males and females, ranks higher in submission for males, and fairly high in hostility towards both. Her rather high score in Category 13 for both men and women shows her to be a disapproving and critical relative.

Older brother (OB). The most distinctive feature of this role is its neutrality. Its scores in all categories are close to zero. This probably is due to older brother's ambiguous age position. He is older than ego but not a member of ego's parents' generation. Consequently, his role has attributes both of equality and of superiority. The result is a role lacking distinctive features.

Younger brother (YB). This is another role lacking distinctive features. The probable explanation is similar to that used for older brother: younger brother is ambivalent regarding age position, for he is younger than ego and yet a member of the same generation. The significant differences between older and younger brother occur in the first two categories. Older brother is a much more dominating figure than younger brother.

Older sister (OS). This role is quite different for men and women. For women, she is a mildly dominant and highly coöperative relative. For men, she is neutral in dominance, affiliation, and submission, but ranks high as a disapproving, critical, and suspicious relative. Significant differences in the roles occur in Categories 2 (to teach) and 6 (to cooperate.

Younger sister (YS). The role of younger sister is quite similar to that of younger brother. It lacks distinctive features, seeming to fall between the roles of daughter and older sister. This is probably due to younger sister's position as a member of ego's generation who is younger than ego.

Male cousin (MaC) and Female cousin (FeC). These role profiles are based on a small number of protocols, since not many people use the cousin terms. Consequently, the profiles should be viewed with much less confidence than those of other relatives. The profiles indicate that cousins are unimportant relatives with whom there is little interaction. An apparent exception is the behavior of female cousins towards females in Category 13 (to disapprove).

Son (So). This relative ranks low in dominance and hostility and high in affection and submission. The profiles for men and women are similar.

Daughter (D). The role profiles for daughter closely resemble those of son; but there is more difference in the male and female profiles than there is for son. The difference is significant in Category 2 (to teach). Large differences also occur in Categories 6 (to coöperate), 7 (to depend), and 8 (to respect) with the profile for women scoring considerably higher.

Brother's child (BCh). This is a relative with whom there is little interaction. He ranks very low in dominance, low in affiliation, low to neutral in submission, and low in hostility. The profiles

554
602
128
593

for men and women are quite similar.

Sister's child (SCh). The role profiles of this relative are almost identical with those of brother's child. Sister's child ranks very low in dominance, low in affiliation, and low to neutral in submission and hostility. The role profiles for men and women are very similar.

A different perspective on Washo role behavior can be obtained from the graphs of the categories. They facilitate comparison of the sixteen roles within the behavioral categories.

Category 1 (to order). The most important relatives in this category are those who are older than ego. Father and mother attain the highest score for both males and females. Father's brother and father's sister for females and mother's brother for males are exceptions to the general rule that older relatives rank high in dominance.

Category 2 (to teach). As might be expected, relatives who are older than ego are ranked high. Older relatives who do not rank high are father's brother and father's sister for females and older sister for males.

Category 3 (to help). Mother and father attain high scores for both men and women. Father's brother and older brother are fairly high for men; older brother, mother's sister, and older sister attain positive scores for women.

Category 4 (to sympathize). Mother and father are the most sympathetic relatives. In addition, a man expects sympathy from his mother's sister and older brother, and a woman from her older brother, older sister, and younger brother.

Category 5 (to like). For women, the important relatives are mother and father. Older brother, older sister, son, and daughter also attain positive scores. All are members of the nuclear family. For males, affection is more widely diffused outside the nuclear family. However, men do not feel themselves as intensely liked as women: note the higher scores of father and mother for females.

Category 6 (to coöperate). There is considerable difference between men and women. The relatives who coöperate with men are men and those who coöperate with women are women. Note also the higher scores of the relatives who coöperate with women as opposed to those who coöperate with men.

Category 7 (to depend). This category of behavior is surprisingly undifferentiated for men. Mother is the only really dependent person. Even son and daughter rank low in dependence. Women see their children as highly dependent upon them.

Category 8 (to respect). One's children are the most respectful relatives. Mother also ranks high in this category. Women feel somewhat more respected than men, as indicated by the scores for daughter and mother.

Category 9 (to obey). The most obedient relatives are son, daughter, and the younger siblings, all of whom are younger than ego. A person has little authority over younger people if they are not members of his nuclear family, as indicated by the scores for brother's child and sister's child.

Category 10 (to want approval). For women, the only positive scores are achieved by members of the nuclear family. Men show a slight positive score for father's brother and mother's sister. As

7[see cat. 116, pp. 372 - 375 --Ed.]

[P. 390, A]

554
128
602
593

in Category 5 (to like), women confine their significant interactions to the family while men have more diffuse and less strongly structured relationships. This is made quite clear by the table of significant distinctions on p. 391 (right). Only two significant distinctions occur among the male role profiles; among the female role profiles, 31 significant distinctions occur.

Category 11 (to suspect wrongdoing). For men, the suspicious relatives are father's brother, father's sister, mother's sister, and older sister. Women have a greater number of suspicious relatives: father, father's sister, mother, mother's brother, and older siblings.

Category 12 (to nag). This is a relatively undifferentiated category. For men, older sister scores higher than all other relatives. Women seem to have no outstanding relatives in this category.

Category 13 (to disapprove). The nodal category for hostility shows a remarkable similarity between male and female role profiles. The only hostile relatives, and they are only mildly hostile, are father's sister, mother's sister, and older sister. Female cousin may be ignored because the cousin profiles are based on but a few protocols. Category 13 for men is similar to Category 11 for men. I can offer no explanation for the concentration of hostility in older female relatives.

[578]

Category 14 (to punish). Older relatives are most prominent in this category. Father's sister is an exception for both men and women and father's brother for women. This category, together with Categories 1 and 2, shows that father's siblings lack dominance over women.

Category 15 (to refuse help). This category emphasizes the nuclear family relationships of father, mother, son, and daughter. They are the relatives with the lowest scores.

[594]

Category 16 (to reject). This category illustrates even more clearly than Category 15 the closeness of a person to his father, mother, son, and daughter.

554
128

Some interesting inferences can be drawn from this review of categories. First, the importance of the nuclear family is clearly emphasized, especially the father, mother, son, and daughter relationships. Second, neither patrilineal relatives nor matrilineal relatives receive greater emphasis; the two groups of relatives have equal importance. Third, there is an interesting difference between men and women. If Appendix D is examined, it will be seen that men have many more significant distinctions among roles in the categories probing dominance (1-4 and 13-16) than in the categories testing submission. Women have a closer to equal number of significant distinctions among roles in the categories probing dominance as in the categories testing for submission. In other words, men tend to see their relationships regarding who dominates them as clearly structured, but are much less clear as to whom they dominate; women see their relationship with subordinate relatives to be structured almost as clearly as their relationships with dominant ones. This may be an indication that Washo males tend to lack self-confidence and that Washo women may have made a more satisfactory adjustment to modern conditions than have the men.

554
128
154

This inference receives support from my observations. Men seemed less inclined to put themselves in

1/2 [see cat. 116, p. 387, A -- Am.]

554
128
154

a situation where their egos could be threatened. For example, they were more reluctant to be interviewed and to take the role profile test.

The apparent differences in the adjustment of Washo men and women resemble the different adjustments to modern conditions made by men and women among the Saulteaux and Ojibwa. Hallowell made a study of acculturation and personality changes among the Saulteaux and concluded that women are better adjusted than men because the male aspects of culture have changed more through acculturation (1942, p. 48). Caudill studied the psychological characteristics of acculturated Ojibwa and also concluded that women seem to make a more satisfactory adjustment to the conditions of modern life than do men (1949, p. 425). The Washo role data can be interpreted as supporting the psychological studies of Hallowell and Caudill.

[171]

ROLE BEHAVIOR AND THE NEW TERMINOLOGICAL SYSTEM

554
602
128
593

The data from the role profile test support the inferences presented at the beginning of this chapter. The table of significant distinctions in Appendix II (p. 395, top) presents the relevant data. As predicted: (1) there are no significant distinctions between either the roles of mother's brother and father's brother or the roles of brother's child and sister's child; and (2) the roles of cousins are well distinguished from the roles of siblings. Older brother and younger brother are both distinguished from male cousin seven times. Older sister is distinguished from female cousin nine times; younger sister is distinguished from female cousin three times. That cousins are well distinguished from siblings while mother's brother resembles father's brother and brother's child is similar to sister's child can be clearly seen from figures 2 to 9 on pp. 372-375.

554
601
128

The inference that the roles associated with the stable parts of the kinship terminology all differ significantly from each other is supported reasonably well by the test data. However, there are five apparent exceptions: no significant distinctions exist between the roles of father and mother, son and daughter, younger brother and younger sister, mother's brother and older brother, and mother's brother and father's sister. The first three exceptions can be easily explained. These relatives are nuclear family members of opposite sex and the same generation. They do not differ in the qualities of their roles, but the sex distinction makes for significant differences in the content of the roles. However, the similarity in the qualities of the roles of father and mother and son and daughter is not ignored in the kinship terminology, for the Washo have two terms meaning "parent" and one meaning "child." In only two instances does role behavior fail to agree with terminological usage: mother's brother is not distinguished from either older brother or father's sister. Consequently, of the 120 possible comparisons among the roles of the three generations studied, 118 support the assumption of a close fit of role and terminological system.

554
601
178
602

Since the terminological system is apparently changing in the face of a relatively stable social structure, at least some of the causes of this change lie outside social organization. What are the cultural causes which appear capable of modifying Washo role behavior so as to produce the emerging system of kinship terminology? In the case of the cousin terms, we must seek

[P. 391, A]

554
601
178
602

cultural causes which would reduce the importance of cousins as compared to siblings, thus setting the stage for the terminological distinction. This result would tend to follow the introduction of a money economy and the subsequent individualization of the society. As we have seen, cooperative activity has lessened among the Washo; and this presumably has meant that distant relatives are not as important as they once were. Consequently, the roles played by cousins have become progressively different from the roles of siblings, and this has been reflected in the kinship terminology. The

[Text continues top of P 391, B]

CONCLUSION

178
601
554

This study has presented an analysis of changes in Washo culture and social organization. It has suggested that the changes in the Washo system of kinship terminology can be explained best by the hypothesis that cultural factors may affect kinship terminology directly instead of indirectly by first modifying elements of formal social structure, such as residence rules and kinds of kin groups. This hypothesis hinged on showing that role behavior is closely correlated with kinship terminology. This assumption was substantially verified by data derived from the role profile test; the Washo role behavior was shown to correlate closely with the new, emerging kinship system. Since changes in formal social structure could not adequately account for changes in the terminological system, it was concluded that cultural factors have directly affected role behavior, thereby causing terminological modification. Finally, some possible cultural factors were suggested to account for changes in role behavior.

[Text continues bottom of P. 391, B]

554
601
178
602

merging of mother's brother and father's brother and of brother's child and sister's child probably is due to three major causes. The first is the individualization of the society, which reduces the importance of relatives not in the nuclear family; the second is the loss of sonsororal polygyny; and the third is the knowledge of the English kinship terminology, which may function as a kind of model for the new Washo kinship terminology. The cultural causes of the changes in Washo kinship terminology suggested here must be regarded only as hypotheses. Their verification requires comparative data.

CONCLUSION

554
125

The role profile test provided much of the data upon which the foregoing demonstration has been based. It has shown itself to be a useful and sensitive instrument for the collection of role data. Its principal value is that it can be treated statistically, and this permits objective role comparisons within a society. Such comparisons can be made just as easily between societies, provided the same statistical analysis is used. The test has some limitations. First, it deals only with the qualities of roles and does not test for their content. Second, the categories may have to be modified from society to society, for there is no certainty that the categories used for the Washo would be satisfactory for other tribes. The test is not meant to replace observation and interviewing; but at the same time it reveals role patterning that would escape all but the most careful and prolonged field work. The role profile test seems to me a most promising technique for the study of role behavior.

A RECONSTRUCTION OF ABORIGINAL WASHO SOCIAL ORGANIZATION[1*]

by Stanley A. Freed

The reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social structure presented here is based upon the publications of earlier investigators and upon data that my wife and I collected in the course of about six months' field work in the summers of 1952, 1953, 1956 and the winter of 1956-57. The major sources on aboriginal Washo social organization are: Barrett (1917), Curtis (1926), Kroeber (1907; 1917), Lowie (1939), and Siskin (1941). Our field data consist principally of interviews with 70 informants who ranged in age from 10 to over 80. Genealogical data, kinship terminology, census material, and brief life histories were collected from all informants. The testimony of our older informants regarding aboriginal conditions and the earlier published reports almost always agree, and thereby make possible a reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social organization that is probably relatively sound. The changes in Washo social structure since aboriginal times will be mentioned here, but a discussion of the probable causes of these changes has been omitted because such an analysis has appeared in an earlier paper (Freed, 1960).

In addition to a description of kinship terminology, residence rules, marriage patterns and other customary categories of analysis of social organization, this paper will attempt to describe role behavior among kinsmen in aboriginal times. This description is based on data from role profile tests taken by 47 Washo in the winter of 1956-57, and therefore pertains to modern role behavior (Freed, 1960, 365-70). The degree to which these patterns of modern role behavior resemble those of aboriginal times cannot be determined with any certainty because the published sources contain virtually no information on role behavior; also, attempts to elicit statements of aboriginal role behavior from elderly informants were unproductive. However, it is possible to make a tentative estimate of the degree to which modern and aboriginal role behavior resemble each other on the basis of a general appraisal of Washo acculturation. The Washo are still a recognizable group; they speak their own language; and, in modified form, they practice a number of aboriginal culture patterns (Freed, 1960). For these reasons we can assume that role behavior among the modern Washo gives some indication of aboriginal role behavior.

Kinship Terminology

The kinship terminology of the aboriginal Washo may be established with relative confidence because the terminologies collected by Kroeber (1907; 1917) and Lowie (1939) not only agree closely with each other but also with

*Notes are at ends of papers.

The Washo had weak agamous moieties whose only apparent function was to oppose each other in games at the annual pinenut dance (Freed, 1960, 361). Actually, three "moieties" were present, but one of them divided its members between the other two when participating in games; hence, the system was fundamentually dual. A person belonged to his father's moiety, which often was also his mother's moiety. When people of different moities married, they could join whichever moiety they wished. One of our male informants claims that a woman always joined her husband's moiety. Lowie says that in the hand game, a man could leave his own moiety and join the opposite moiety if it were having better luck (Lowie, 1939, 304). The moiety system does not exist today.

Settlements were very small. Lowie (1939, 303) states that the usual settlement had two to four houses, and that no village had as many as 10 houses. Neighbors were often kinsmen, but they might also be non-relatives. Modern Washo settlements are much larger than aboriginal ones; the largest, Dresslerville, Nevada, has a population of approximately 200.

Marriage

Curtis (1926, 97) and Barrett (1917, 9) report that polygyny was formerly practiced. Barrett notes that monogamy was as prevalent as polygyny. Lowie (1939, 309) says that both sororal and nonsororal polygyny existed, with a tendency to favor the sororal form because the Washo believed that strange women will fight. Barrett says that a man's choice of subsequent wives was not restricted. Both the sororate and the levirate occurred. Both were correct but not compulsory, according to Lowie. Curtis states that a widow had to marry her husband's brother if he desired her. Our informants support Lowie, both with regard to the preference for sororal as opposed to nonsororal polygyny and the noncompulsory character of the levirate. Polygyny, the sororate, and the levirate are no longer practiced. Many of the modern Washo contract a series of monogamous marriages with the earlier ones often of short duration and the later ones lasting considerably longer. Some Washo remain with their original marriage partners for life.

Role Behavior

The following descriptions of the role behavior of relatives in ego's generation and the first ascending and descending generations are based on the role profile test. The relatives of the second and third ascending and descending generations were not included when the test was given. However, a

602 ● 125 554

brief description of the behavior of relatives separated by two or three generations is included. This is based upon observations and a few rather general statements of informants.

The administration and analysis of the role profile tests and the characteristics of the group of people who took them are described in Freed (1960). The role profile test asks 16 questions probing various features of interpersonal behavior. The questionnaire is given below. All the questions are related to four general qualities of interpersonal interaction: dominance, submission, affiliation and hostility. The strongest and purest expressions of these qualities are in questions one (dominance), five (affiliation), nine (submission), and 13 (hostility). The questions between any two of these attempt to combine their qualities in varying degrees. For example, "to teach" (question two) combines dominance and affiliation; "to respect" (question eight) combines affiliation and submission; "to nag" (question 12) combines submission and hostility; and "to refuse help" (question 15) combines hostility and dominance. The data of the role profile test can be quantified, and this permits an objective description and comparison of roles. The quantitative treatment of roles and their similarities and differences is given in Freed (1960). This paper will describe roles only in qualitative terms.

Questionnaire of the Role Profile Test

(The words in parentheses were useful in improving the informants' understanding of the questions)

1. Which relative most often tries to tell you what to do? Which most often gives you orders (or bosses you)?

2. Which relative most often teaches you how to do something? Which one gives you advice or tells you his opinions?

3. Which relative is most likely to help you if you need it?

4. Which relative is most likely to feel bad and sympathize with you when something goes wrong?

5. Which relative is specially fond of you?

6. Which relative most often cooperates (works together) with you?

125
602
554

7. Which relative depends on you most and most often asks your help?

8. Which relative respects you the most? Which one asks your opinions?

9. Which relative obeys (minds) you if you tell him or her to do something?

10. Which relative is most eager for your approval?

11. Which relative would be the most likely to say or think you did something wrong (or bad)?

12. Which relative nags you most?

13. Which relative disapproves of you and criticizes you most often?

14. Which relative punishes you or gets angry (or mad) if you don't mind or if you do something wrong (or bad)?

15. Which relative is most likely to refuse you help even if you need it pretty badly?

16. Which relative would be most likely not to want to have anything at all to do with you?

125
157
554
602

Father. This is a dominant relative. He rates fairly high in affiliation, rather neutral in submission, and generally low in hostility. Despite his low score in hostility, the father is a disciplinarian for both men and women as shown by his high score on question 14 (to punish). Women see him as a mildly suspicious and disapproving figure as shown by a fairly high score on question 11. The role of father differs considerably for men and women in teaching (question 2). A father instructs his sons much more than his daughters.

Father's brother. This role differs markedly for men and women. Father's brother is a much more important relative for men than for women as shown by his higher scores when rated by men on all questions except the last two, which show rejection. The role of father's brother for men is similar to that of father except that father scores significantly higher on the first two questions (to order and to teach). For women, father's brother is an unimportant relative, with low scores on all questions, except the last two.

Father's sister. She is a rather cold and hostile relative for both men and women. She scores high only on hostility (questions 11 to 13) and

157
125
602
554

rejection (questions 15 and 16). She possesses no disciplinary power either for men or women as shown by her low score on question 14 (to punish).

Mother. The mother's role is similar to the father's. She scores high in dominance and affiliation. Her score in submission is higher than father's. She scores low in hostility, but, like father, she is a disciplinarian as indicated by her fairly high score on question 14 (to punish). There is no contradiction between a high score in dominance and also a rather high score in submission. This means only that when the mother becomes old she sometimes may be dependent upon her children. Women see their mothers as much more suspicious than do men, as indicated by the mother's significantly higher score on question 11 (to suspect wrongdoing) when rated by women.

Mother's brother. His scores are neutral in dominance and affiliation and low in submission. He is a more suspicious and hostile figure for women than for men, as shown by his high score on questions 11 (to suspect wrongdoing) and 15 (to refuse help) when rated by women. For men, he is an unimportant relative with low or neutral scores on all questions except the last, which shows rejection.

Mother's sister. This relative is a much more dominating figure for women than for men. She is neutral in affiliation for both men and women, scores higher in submission for males, and scores rather high in hostility for both. Noteworthy features of her role are the high score on question 2 (to teach) for women and the rather high score for both men and women on question 13 (to disapprove).

Older brother. The most noteworthy feature of this role is its neutrality. Older brother's scores are neither very high nor very low on any question. His role is very similar for both men and women. The lack of distinctiveness in the role of older brother is probably due to his position as a relative older than ego yet of the same generation. This gives the role of elder brother elements of both superiority and equality which tend to neutralize each other.

Younger brother. The role of younger brother also lacks distinctive features; the reason is probably the same as in the case of older brother: younger brother is younger than ego, but a member of his generation. The roles of older and younger brother differ considerably in dominance; older brother is much more dominating than younger. The role of younger brother is very similar for men and women.

Older sister. The role of older sister is quite different for men and women. For women, she is a dominating, very cooperative, and rather critical relative as shown by her high scores on questions 1 (to order), 2 (to

157
125
602
554

teach), 6 (to cooperate), and 13 (to disapprove). For men, older sister is rather neutral regarding affiliation; she scores somewhat higher on both submission and dominance; and she is a very critical relative, as shown by her high scores on questions 11 (to suspect wrongdoing), 12 (to nag), 13 (to disapprove), 15 (to refuse help), and 16 (to reject).

Younger sister. The role of younger sister is quite similar to that of younger brother. She rates low or neutral in dominance, affiliation and hostility. Her rather high score on question 9 when rated by males shows that she obeys her older brother reasonably well.

Son. Son scores low on dominance and hostility and high on affiliation and submission when rated by men. The role of son is generally the same for women informants, except that son is a somewhat more hostile relative, as shown by his higher scores on questions 12 to 14, when rated by women.

Daughter. For men, daughter scores very low in dominance, neutral in affiliation, and very low in hostility. Her only noticeably high score, when rated by men, is on question 9 (to obey). For women, daughter scores low in dominance, but not nearly as low as she scores for men. Daughter scores higher in affiliation for women than for men, as shown by her higher scores on questions 6 (to cooperate), 7 (to depend), and 8 (to respect). Daughter also scores noticeably higher on question 12 (to nag) for women than for men.

Brother's child. This is a relative with whom there is little interaction either by men or women. Scores are low for almost all questions. Brother's child's highest score is on question 9 (to obey) for men. He ranks very low in dominance, a bit higher in affection, low to neutral in submission, and low in hostility for both men and women.

Sister's child. The role of this relative is very similar to that of brother's child. Her scores are low on all questions. She is a slightly more hostile figure toward men than is brother's child.

[603]
[586]

Relatives separated by two or three generations. The outstanding characteristics of behavior between such relatives are affection and the rendering of assistance. We noticed on many occasions that young children take care of their grandparents, especially if the old people are partially incapacitated. Old people are very fond of children. When young married people separate, grandparents sometimes take and rear the children.

[128]

The data from the role profile tests can be organized by question as well as by role. That is, the behavior of all relatives on any one question can be considered together rather than the behavior of any one relative on all

125 questions as has been done above. The former kind of analysis facilitates
157 comparisons of all roles on any question. This comparison is given in Freed
554 (1960, 369-70) and reveals several interesting features of Washo social organ-
602 ization. First, the importance of the nuclear family is clearly shown, espe-
[128] cially the father, mother, son and daughter relationships. Second, men co-
[594] operate with men and women with women. Third, although authority in the
[476] society rests in the older people, father's siblings have little authority over brother's daughters and mother's brother has little over sister's son. Fourth, the principal hostile relatives for both men and women are older women: father's sister, mother's sister, and older sister. Fifth, both patrilineal and matrilineal relatives seem to have equal importance in Washo social organization.

121 This paper has presented a reconstruction of aboriginal Washo social
128 structure and has noted the changes that have taken place since pre-white times. The descriptions of role behavior are based upon data from the modern Washo, but are thought to give some suggestion of aboriginal Washo role behavior because the Washo have retained their group identity and practice, in modified form, a number of aboriginal culture patterns.

Notes

122 1. The field work upon which this paper is based was supported by
104 a grant from the Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley, to whom my thanks are due. Unless noted otherwise, Washo words are written in a phonemic system devised for Washo by William H. Jacobsen, Jr., who did his work under the Survey of California Indian Languages, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.

881 602 574 (431)

For the first two days only the immediate family and relatives were concerned. It was up to them to provide the food for the feast and gifts for guests. A close relative could eat at the feasts, but would never take one of the gifts. The close relatives played the leading roles in the ceremony.

[593] [302]

The girl's mother, older sister, or some other woman would comb her hair, assist the girl to stand up, and keep her from making mistakes. This assistant (desú·) was not necessarily the same woman for the whole four days.

Her father or uncle "talked" for her health, announced the customs of the ceremony, and told about all the fine food that had been brought for the feast. Her mother, grandmother, and some other old and respected woman bathed and prayed for her during the ceremony.

881 778 (824)

The staff (bá·du? ʔúhu?) that the girl carried was made from a strong straight piece of elderberry wood about 7 ft. long. The bark was peeled off and the staff was painted with red ocher in bands or all over. The staff was prepared by the girl's assistant on the first day of her menstruation. When the staff was completed the assistant would speak to it saying "My stick don't fall down. Help this girl." It was important that the staff never fall to the ground for it was symbolic of the girl -- straight, erect and strong.

[431]

During the woman's dance (ʔuwí·ya) a present of buckskin, feathers, or moccasins was tied to the staff. This present was taken off by one of the woman dancers. The staff also served as a scratching stick.

On the morning after the dance and the girl's bath, the staff was taken by the girl's father and hidden somewhere on a mountain side. The father placed or tied the staff upright next to a young living tree. It was preferably placed on the north side of a tree where the sun would not strike it and bend it. Some say that a brother or sister may take the staff to the mountain side and that the staff may be leaned against a rock, placed in a hole dug in the ground, or placed in a natural crevice in the rocks. After it had been hidden it was left untouched. It was believed to aid the girl through her life, giving her legs the strength and lightness to climb the mountains.

881 313

One of the girl's tasks was to gather wood for the fires of her ceremony. Her assistant, brothers, sisters, or friends were permitted to help her. Some of this wood was placed ready for a fire where the dance would be. The rest was placed in four piles up the side of a nearby hill to the top.

14:Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute NR13
Washo NT20

with them. Nonetheless, 30 informants are averse to peyotism on grounds that Ben is "robbing the Indians."

A significant economic argument against peyotism is neglect of farms and cattle and lost employment because of excessive devotion to religion. In the first months of Ben's proselyting, from two to four meetings were often held on as many consecutive nights and fanaticism kept some away from their responsibilities.

Members say that shamans and gambling-house proprietors probably dislike the cult because it takes away some of their clientele.[4] Two who temporarily joined the peyote religion were known to be hypochondriacs, one a steady customer of shamans, the other a frequent inmate of the hospital. Gamblers would be expected to resist a religion which held all-night meetings on Saturday nights. Moreover, it is suggested that bootleggers instigated some antagonism.

Kinship, friendship, and the satisfaction derived from a sociable in-group were also important factors contributing to the spread and growth of peyotism.[5] Just as real or assumed blood relationship and friendship facilitated Ben's introduction of the cult, family ties were important in increasing and holding members. An examination of the list in Appendix IV shows that most active peyotists have kinfolk in the cult. However, this list also shows enough close relatives of members to be apostates or actively opposed to void any generalization that kinship wholly determines participation. Although only a few designate the pleasure of singing and meeting together as a reason for attendance, the enthusiastic preparation of gourd rattles, fans, etc., and the almost nightly singing practices indicate that the desire for social contact helps to convert and hold the Indians to peyotism.[6]

The basis for arguments of both peyotists and nonpeyotists is unverified opinion, wishful thinking, conscious or unconscious distortion of facts. Because of one or two apparently miraculous recoveries members attribute to peyote the power to cure all illness. Desiring to get well or to have their friends or families healed, they are prepared to accept excuses for failures. Opponents, on the other hand, blame peyote for the few deaths which followed attendance at rituals, maintaining peyote is a poison and that all users meet untimely ends. Opponents insist that peyotism is not a religion at all, but a congregation of narcotic addicts disguising their true purpose in order to avoid legal interference. To the members, however, peyotism is a religion, and it is extremely difficult, when listening to their prayers, to doubt their complete sincerity. So the argument swings on each point. Each side has as much truth as the other. Through associations and chance, these people choose what to believe.

DISCUSSION OF DIFFUSION

Whenever the diffusion of native religions has been studied, two theories, singly or combined, have been used to explain the phenomenon. The first, the cultural compatibility theory, postulates that new institutions will be acceptable to a people

[4] Parsons' account (pp. 67–68, 118–119) of opposition to peyote at Taos shows similar motivation: "The practice of . . . the outstanding shaman of the town is interfered with by peyote doctoring. I surmise that it was not until Porfirio realized the danger of this competition that the active opposition to the cult developed."

[5] Kinship and friendship facilitated the diffusion of the 1870 Ghost Dance, as well as the peyote cult. Du Bois reports (p. 135) intertribal marriages precipitated the transmission of the 1870 Dance from Shasta to Karok, Yurok to Tolowa to Tututni. Friendship aided a California Shasta proselyting related Shasta and other tribes on the Siletz and Grand Ronde reservations in Oregon. La Barre reports (pp. 112, 116) that "marital ties have often . . . been the source of the spread of peyote"; the first Comanche user learned of peyote when he married an Apache woman; Rave's first converts were his Winnebago relatives; a Modoc in Oklahoma became a peyotist through marriage to a Quapaw.

[6] La Barre states (p. 59) that "the primary reason for Northern Cheyenne meetings is social."

14:Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute NR13
Washo NT20

APPENDIX IV. PEYOTISTS AND THEIR RELATIVES

The following is a list of all active peyotists in the Washo-Paiute cult in November, 1938, with the status of as many kin as possible entered. No claim to completeness is made, since half-brothers and sisters and cousins are seldom mentioned by Indians. Peyotists always mentioned also their kin who were members, but frequently ignored their nonpeyotist relatives. Complete genealogies of all Washo and Northern Paiute Indians in this area, going back three generations, would be required for completeness, and such a task would require several months.

In the list, kinship abbreviations are: h, husband; w, wife; si, sister; b, brother; s, son; d, daughter; f, father; m, mother; c, cousin; g (combined with above), grandparents or grandchildren; st (combined with the above), step-parents or stepchildren; l (combined with above), in-law; ne, niece; nph, nephew; a, aunt; u, uncle; figures indicate number in category. Other abbreviations are: F, female; M, male; S, Shoshone; P, Paiute; W, Washo; M, Miwuk; 1 (under column "Blood"), full-blood.

14:Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute NR13
Washo NT20
N
W
171
602
945

ACTIVE PEYOTISTS IN THE WASHO-PAIUTE CULT

Name	Peyotists				Relatives			
	Sex	Age	Tribe	Blood	Active peyotists	Inactive peyotists	Nonpeyotists	
							Unconcerned	Militantly opposed
Fallon Reservation								
1. Byers, L.	F	26	S	1	c, h, ss, b			
2. Burchim, C.	M	40	S	1	w, std, c			
3. Burchim, I.	F	37	P	1	h, d	stf	2 u, 2 b	
4. Jack, M.	F	17	P	1	m, stf			
5. Dyer, F.	M	45	S	1	w, 2 d, c		s	
6. Dyer, H.	F	43	S	1	h, 2 d		s s	
7. Dyer, D.	F	23	S	1	m, f, ss		h	
8. Dyer, A.	F	21	S	1	m, f, ss			
Fallon Town								
9. Jack, H.	M	41	P (S)	1	c	b	w	f
10. Street, J.	M	46	S	1	w, ss, bl			
11. Street, M.	F	32	S	1	c, h, ss, bl			
Gardnerville								
12. Dressler, H.	M	69	W	1	nph, s, 2 d, 2 s, bl	nph	b, gs	
13. Dressler, G.	M	36	W	1	c, f, 3 ss, 2 bl	c, s	u, nph	
14. Pete, Irene	F	28	W	1	bl, c, f, 2 ss, b, h	c, s	u, nph	
15. Dressler, R.	F	33	W	1	c, f, 2 ss, b, 2 bl	c, s	u, nph	
16. James, M.	F	58	W	¾	2 s, d, 2 gd		dl, h, 2 s	sl, dl, gd, d
17. James, D.	M	35	W	¾	m, ss, b, 2 nc		ssl, f, 2 b	bl, ssl, nc, ss
18. James R.	M	29	W	¾	m, ss, b, 2 nc		ssl, f, 2 b	bl, ssl, nc, ss
19. Lancaster, M.	F	66	W	1	nph		b	
20. Miller, B.	M	21	W	½	fl, w, ml			
21. Miller, G.	F	23	P	1	h, m, f			

Name*	Peyotists				Relatives			
	Sex	Age	Tribe	Blood	Active peyotists	Inactive peyotists	Nonpeyotists	
							Unconcerned	Militantly opposed
Douglas County								
22. Arnot, E.	M	56	W	1	w, s			
23. Arnot, H.	F	46	W	1	h, s			
24. Arnot, S.	M	20	W	1	f, m			
25. Pete, H.	M		W	1	w, ml			
26. Pete, W. J.	F	30	W	1	h, m			
27. Simpson, H.	F	59	W	1	d, sl			
28. Dick, S.	M	43	W	1	3 std, sts, w, m, c, u			
29. Dick, I. M.	F	47	P	1	3 d, bl, h, m, ml, s			
30. Dick, S.	F	64	W	1	s, dl, b, nph			
31. Dick, S. G.	M	69	W	1	ss, nph			
32. Mike, L.	F	34	W	1	2 nph			
33. Peters, M.	M	21	W	1	b, s			
34. Peters, E.	M	27	W	1	b, s			
35. Lancaster, Ben	M	60	W	½	bl, w, 2 s, c			
Mason Valley								
36. Keno, James	M	62	P	1	w, s, dl			
37. Keno, M.	F	47	P	1	h, s, dl, c			
38. Keno, W.	M	28	P	1	m, f, w, u			
39. Keno, N.	F	18	P	1	h, ml, fl			
Smith Valley								
40. Cornbread, V.	M	36	W	1	2 bl, w, fl, 2 asl			
41. Cornbread, R.	F	38	W	1	h, f, bl, 2 ss, b			
42. Milton, J.	M	53	P	1	w, 2 d, 2 sl			
43. Milton, M.	F	55	P	1	c, h, 2 d, 2 sl			
44. Sam, R.	M	36	P	1	sl, bl, w, ml, fl			
45. Sam, M.	F	32	P	1	h, m, f, s, bl			
46. Wilson, A.	F	58	P	1				

* Indention of names in this column indicates relationship or residence with the preceding nonindented name.

(*Continued on next page*)

N W 171 662 795*

14:Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute NR13
Washo NT20
NW 171 602 *795

ACTIVE PEYOTISTS IN THE WASHO-PAIUTE CULT—(*Continued*)

Name	Peyotists				Relatives			
	Sex	Age	Tribe	Blood	Active peyotists	Inactive peyotists	Nonpeyotists	
							Unconcerned	Militantly opposed
Mono County								
47. Sam, F.	M	46	P	1	w, s, d			nph
48. Sam, B.	F	35	P	1	h, s, d			
49. Sam, E.	F	17	P	1	m, f, b			
50. Sam, J.	M	15	P	1	m, f, s			
51. Tom, H.	M	41	P	1	bl, m, w, b, 2 s			s, bl
52. Tom, C.	F	31	P	1	2 bl, h, ml			
53. Williams, V.	F	35	P	1	s			h
54. Williams, C.	M	16	P	1	m			f
55. Charley, T.	F	67	P	1	d			2 nph
56. Charley, N.	F	24	P	1	m			b, c
57. Gregory, N.	F	59	P	1				
58. Harrison, J.	F	75	P	1				
59. Lundy, S.	M	43	M	1	f, b, w			
60. Lundy, Sally	F	40	P	1	h			
61. Jack, J.	M	43	P	1	w			
62. Jack, E.	F	30	P	1	h			
63. Johnson, R.	F	70	P	1				
64. McLaughlin, A.	F	82	P	1				nph
65. Lundy, John	M	17	P-(M)	1	f, m			w, fl
66. Dick, E.	M	39	(M)-P	1			d	ss, sl
67. Charles, D.	M	40	P	1	b			
68. Lundy, B.	M	29	M	1	b, ssl, f			
69. Lundy, J.	M	67	M	1	2 s, dl			
70. Tom, L.	F	66	P	1	2 sl, 2 s, 2 d, 3 gd			2 gs, gd, d, sl
71. Tom, Lee	M	45	P	1	m, b, 2 ss, 2 bl			bl, ss, c, nph
72. Harrison, L.	F	23	P	1	m, gm, stf, 2 ss			u, a, 3 c
73. Harrison, J.	F	21	P	1	2 u, 2 a, m, gm, stf, 2 ss			u, a, 3 c
74. Harrison, A.	F	17	P	1	2 u, 2 a, m, gm, stf, 2 ss			u, a, 3 c
75. Cornbread, H.	F	22	P-(W)	1	2 ss	m		ss, gf

Name*	Peyotists				Relatives			
	Sex	Age	Tribe	Blood	Active peyotists	Inactive peyotists	Nonpeyotists	
							Unconcerned	Militantly opposed
76. Dick, Sadie	F	32	P	1	ml, 2 sal, 2 bl	3 bl, h, 2 sal		
77. Dick, Levi	M	44	P-(W)	1	w, ss, b, ml, m	3 b, 2 ss		
78. Dick, L.	F	44	W	1	bl, 2 sal, h, m, ml	3 bl, 2 sl		
79. Higgins, J.	F	65	W	1	d, sl			
80. Dick, M.	F	66	P	1	2 s, 2 dl	3 s, 2 d		
81. Dick, S.	N	41	P-(W)	1	ml, w, m, b, 2 sal	3 b, 2 ss		
82. Dick, E.	F	23	P	1	2 sal, h, m, bl	2 sal, 3 bl		
83. Pete, L.	M	73	W	1	w, s, d		s	
84. Pete, J.	F	61	W	1	h, s, d		s s	
85. Pete, Jarvis	M	33	W	1	m, f, ss		b	
86. Walker, C.	M	59	W	1	f, nph			sl, 2 b, 2 sal
87. Walker, A.	F	52	W	1	f, nph			2 bl, 2 sal
88. Walker, R.	M	21	W	1	u, s			f, stm, u, s
Nixon								
89. Frazier, E.	M	58	P	1	w			s
90. Frazier, M.	F	60	P	1	h			s s
91. Green, J.	M	63	P	1				d
92. Jim, W.	M	46	P	1				
93. Mason, B.	F	59	P	1	3 s, ss, dl			
94. Sam, S.	M	26	P	1	s, 3 b, m, nph			
95. Sam, A.	M	24	P	1	s, m, 3 b, nph			
96. Sam, R.	M	21	P	1	s, m, 3 b, nph			
97. Sam, H.	M	34	P	1	m, w, 3 b, s			
98. Sam, L.	F	25	P	1	3 bl, ml, h			
99. Sam, M.	F	67	P	1	s, 4 nph, dl			
100. Sam, W.	M	47	P	1	m, w, 4 c			
101. Sam, I.	F	41	P	1	h, ml			

* Indention of names in this column indicates relationship or residence with the preceding nonindented name.

(*Concluded on next page*)

N
W
171
662
785*

14:Stewart E-5 (1936-1938)1944 NR13 Northern Paiute NR13
Washo NT20 ●
N
W
171
● 602
4795

ACTIVE PEYOTISTS IN THE WASHO-PAIUTE CULT—(*Concluded*)

Name[a]	Peyotists				Relatives			
	Sex	Age	Tribe	Blood	Active peyotists	Inactive peyotists	Nonpeyotists	
							Unconcerned	Militantly opposed
Woodfords								
102. Fillmore, D.	F		W		b, m, gm, 2 u, f	ss	gf, 2u	h, bl, 2 a, ss
103. Cornbread, D.	M		W		ml, a, w, 2 bl, s	d	2 bl, fl	2 sl, d, 2 ssl
104. Cornbread, E.	F		W		m, 2 b, d, s	d	f, 2 b	bl, sl, ss, d
105. Cornbread, G.	M		W		m, f, gm, ss, 2 u	ss	gf, 2 u	bl, ss
106. Barton, J.	M		W					
107. Miller, L.	M		W		a			
Bishop								
108. Tom, Soda	M		P		w, sd, 2 nph			s, gs
109, Tom, Mrs. S.	F		P		h, d, 2 nph			
110. Charles, J.	M		P		b, u, s, c			
111. Moose, R.	F		P		2 c, m, sf			

[a] Indention of names in this column indicates relationship or residence with the preceding nonindented name.